



Internal Reviews

Performance Period January 2006-March 2006

Introduction

Seventeen complexes conducted their Internal Reviews during the third quarter of fiscal year 2006 (January 2006-March 2006). Reviews conducted this quarter started the fourth year of implementing an internally driven system for examining the performance of local service systems in providing services and supports for students with special needs. This report provides data regarding the results of the reviews conducted during the quarter.

Findings

Internal Reviews were conducted in the third quarter in 17 of the 41 complexes. Including the previous quarter's 22 complexes, this represents more than half of the complexes that will conduct Internal Reviews this school year.

In the quarter, 94% of the complexes conducting Internal Reviews achieved the desired goal of 85% for acceptable system performance. One complex, Hana, did not meet the objective with 67% of the youths receiving acceptable ratings. There were a total of four cases with unacceptable system performance; one of the cases at the high school level and another at the middle school level receiving School-Based Behavioral Health services and the remaining two cases at the elementary level receiving care coordination from the Family Guidance Center. For child status, 94% of the students reviewed received acceptable ratings. Eighty-eight percent of the complexes met the child performance goal of 85%. Two complexes, Hana (83%) and Kailua (79%), did not meet the goal for child status. Complexes with unacceptable child/system performance ratings have developed corrective action plans with targeted strategies for improving areas of concern identified in the review.

Below are the Statewide results for all Internal Reviews conducted in the third quarter (January 2006-March 2006):

STATE TOTAL n=249		
Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 90% (n=225)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 4% (n=9)	94% (n=234)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 4% (n=10)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 2% (n=5)	
94% (n=235)		

Table 1. Statewide Internal Review Results (Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2006)

Child Status and System Performance results for each complex reviewed in the third quarter (January 2006-March 2006) Internal Reviews are displayed below in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of Internal Reviews for Child Status and System Performance (Third Quarter, FY 2006)

Complex	Date	Sample Size	Child Status SY 2005-2006	System Performance SY 2005-2006
Hana	January 23-27, 2006	12	83%	67%
Kalani	January 23-27, 2006	12	92%	92%
Ka'u	January 23-27, 2006	13	100%	100%
Kapolei	January 30-February 3, 2006	16	94%	88%
Mililani	January 30-February 3, 2006	21	95%	95%
Waimea (West Kauai)	January 30-February 3, 2006	13	100%	100%
Honoka'a	February 6-10, 2006	12	100%	100%
McKinley	February 6-10, 2006	13	100%	100%
Moanalua	February 6-10, 2006	13	92%	92%
Maui High	February 13-17, 2006	18	100%	94%
Waipahu	February 13-17, 2006	20	90%	90%
Campbell	February 13-24, 2006	20	100%	100%
Baldwin	February 21-24, 2006	12	100%	100%
Kea'au	February 21-24, 2006	13	92%	100%
Kaimuki	March 6-10, 2006	14	93%	93%
Lahainaluna	March 6-10, 2006	13	92%	92%
Kailua	March 15-16, 20-21, & 23, 2006	14	79%	93%

Description of the Samples

There were a total of 249 students reviewed in the quarter. Table 3 shows the distribution of cases reviewed across school levels and Early Intervention.

Table 3. Distribution of the Sample (Third Quarter, FY 2006)

	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Early Intervention	3rd Quarter
Hana	5	4	3	0	12
Kalani	4	3	5	0	12
Ka'u	3	4	5	1	13
Kapolei	5	4	6	1	16
Mililani	6	5	9	1	21
Waimea (West Kauai)	4	3	5	1	13
Honoka'a	4	2	6	0	12
McKinley	4	2	6	1	13
Moanalua	4	3	5	1	13
Maui High	5	5	7	1	18
Waipahu	6	4	9	1	20
Campbell	5	4	10	1	20
Baldwin	4	3	5	0	12
Kea'au	5	3	4	1	13
Kaimuki	4	3	7	0	14
Lahainaluna	4	3	5	1	13
Kailua	6	1	6	1	14
Total	78	56	103	12	249

Further description of the sample is presented in Table 4. Sampling guidelines call for samples to be based on 2% of the IDEA population and 1% of the 504-student population. Of the total number of cases reviewed in the third quarter (N=249), 20% were receiving care coordination from the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division (CAMHD). Overall, approximately 53% were IDEA or 504 Felix class students that are receiving case management services by the schools, 22% were IDEA non-Felix students, and 5% were receiving Early Intervention Services.

The State did adhere to the process for establishing the sample for all complexes and every effort was made to include the original youths picked through a random sampling process. In a number of complexes, the selected youth fell off the sample due to having moved out of the complex, or having siblings in the sample, or there were too few CAMHD or Early Intervention youths in the complex.

Table 4. Description of the Sample (Third Quarter, FY 2006)

	CAMHD	IDEA / 504 SBBH	IDEA/ Non-SBBH	Early Intervention	3rd Quarter
Hana	3	6	3	0	12
Kalani	3	6	3	0	12
Ka'u	3	6	3	1	13
Kapolei	3	9	3	1	16
Mililani	5	10	5	1	21
Waimea (West Kauai)	3	6	3	1	13
Honoka'a	3	6	3	0	12
McKinley	0	9	3	1	13
Moanalua	3	6	3	1	13
Maui High	3	10	4	1	18
Waipahu	4	11	4	1	20
Campbell	3	12	4	1	20
Baldwin	3	6	3	0	12
Kea'au	3	7	2	1	13
Kaimuki	3	8	3	0	14
Lahainaluna	3	6	3	1	13
Kailua	3	7	3	1	14
Total	51	131	55	12	249

Table 5 displays the range of IDEA disability categories that were represented in the samples. The 249 youths reviewed represented the 14 IDEA eligibility categories, 504 Felix students, and children who are categorized as Early Intervention IDEA. The largest percentage of youths was in the category of Emotional Disturbance (23%). Specific Learning Disability (19%) and Other Health Impairments (17%) were the next most frequent.

Table 5. Disability Categories (Third Quarter, FY 2006)

	Hana	Kalani	Ka'u	Kapolei	Mililani	Waimea (West Kauai)	Honoka'a	McKinley	Moanalua	Maui High	Waipahu	Campbell	Baldwin	Kea'au	Kaimuki	Lahainaluna	Kailua	Total
Autism		1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	14
Deaf/Blindness																		0
Deafness																1		1
Developmental Delay		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	19
Emotional Disturbance	5	3	5	3	5	1	4	3	4	2	5	5	2	1	5	2	3	58
Hearing Impairment					1	1		1										3
Mental Retardation	1				1			1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1		1	14
Multiple Disabilities		1		1						1	1	1						5
Orthopedic Impairment					1	1				1	1			1				5
Other Health Impairments	3	2	1	4	4	1		3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	4	2	42
Specific Learning Disability	1	2		3	3	3	4	1	1	4	4	7	4	2	2	3	3	47
Speech/Language Impairment	1		3	1	2									1			1	9
Traumatic Brain Injury	1	1	1															3
Visual Impairment						1												1
504 Felix		1		1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	16
IDEA, Early Intervention			1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	12
3rd Quarter	12	12	13	16	21	13	12	13	13	18	20	20	12	13	14	13	14	249

Participants

A total of 368 school, Family Guidance Center (FGC) and University of Hawaii (UH) personnel, and community members, including parents, participated in the Internal Reviews conducted in the reporting quarter. The participants represented 30 different role groups. The largest group represented was Special Education Teachers (96), followed by School Counselors (44), Resource Teachers (40), Teachers (30), and DOE Contracted Mentors and Student Services Coordinators (25). There was some duplication in counts for State-level DOE staff, CAMHD Performance Management staff, and Quality Assurance Specialists, who participated in multiple complex reviews.

Table 6. Internal Review Participants (Third Quarter, FY 2006)

	Hana	Kalani	Ka'u	Kapolei	Millani	Waimea (West Kauai)	Honoka'a	McKinley	Moanalua	Maui High	Waipahu	Campbell	Baldwin	Kea'au	Kaimuki	Lahainaluna	Kailua	Total
Counselor (School, Special Education, High Risk, Academic, 504, Department Chair)		1		8	13				3	1	5	7		2	3		1	44
Educational Assistant																		0
Principal					3						2				1		3	9
Vice Principal					2				1	1	2				4	2	3	15
Psychological Examiner					1				1	1							1	4
DOE Contracted Mentors		3	2	2	2		2	1	2	3	2	1	1	3		1		25
DOE Contracted: Others										1								1
Resource Teacher (State, District, Complex, PSAP, Student Support, Literacy, CSSS)	3	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	1	5	3		2	2	6	2	3	40
SBBH Therapist, Manager					1				1					2		1	4	9
Psychologist (District, Complex, School)					2					4								6
Special Education Department Chair				1							1							2
Special Education Teacher (including Pre-School Teacher)		6		13	14				7		10	14		12	10	3	7	96
Speech Language Pathologist		1																1
Student Services Coordinator				3	1				1	3	4			3	2	5	3	25
Teacher (General Ed, Title I, Reading, Transition, GT)					2				3	1	5	13		3	3			30
Coordinator (Evaluation, School Health, SID, Curriculum, Literacy, Rise)				1					1	1	1				1			5
School Assessment Liaison, SAC		1																1
Librarian, Reading Specialist																		0
Autism Consultant																		0
Special Education Director, Educational Specialist, School Renewal Specialist, District Educational Specialist, Retired Administrator, DOE Administrator			1			1		1		3		1			1	1	2	11
Social Worker					1												1	2
Parent/Community Member, UH Faculty Member							1											1
Branch Chief, Clinical Director, Mokihana Director																		0
CAMHD Program Manager, Supervisor						1		1				1	1	1			1	6
Quality Assurance Specialist, DOH						1		1			1							3
Family Support Worker, FGC																		0
Mental Health Care Coordinator, Mentor		2		1	2				1	2				1		1		10
Mental Health Supervisor																		0
Public Health Nurse																		0
Early Intervention Personnel			2	2	2	2		3	2	1	2	1		2		1	2	22
3rd Quarter Total Participants	3	16	7	32	49	6	5	9	24	27	38	38	4	31	31	17	31	368

Review Outcomes and Trends

Statewide Child Status and System Performance Findings

As previously discussed, 94%, or 16 of the 17 complexes reviewed in the quarter performed acceptably well in performance of their local service systems. Fifteen of the seventeen complexes did well across measures of child status. Indicators for responsible behavior and stability remain a concern for a number of the youths reviewed. The lack of acceptable performance in this indicator means that a number of youths are not receiving services in school or in-home settings that are free from risk of disruption, or that youths are not learning the skills and behaviors that will allow them to be successful. Responsibility, stability and consistency of settings are important factors in youths achieving a sense of identity, security, attachments and optimal social development.

Most of the complexes also performed well across the indicators of current system performance. Long-term views, contingency plans, urgent responses, and finding what works to impact students' academic achievement were identified as areas needing improvement in a number of complexes. Each complex with identified performance issues in these areas have developed targeted improvement strategies that are under review by the State Office.

Hana Performance Findings

As discussed previously, Hana was the only complex during the reporting quarter that did not meet the performance threshold of 85% acceptable system performance. Of the 12 youths reviewed in the complex; three received care coordination from the FGC, six through SBBH, and three were IDEA only. System performance for these youths, as seen in Table 7, shows that four of the twelve had unacceptable results. Core system issues revolved around inadequate identification, address of focal concerns, unity of effort across agencies, adequate service intensity, and unsuccessful transitions. Two of the youths with unacceptable performance by their service teams were receiving care coordination through the Family Guidance Center, and two through SBBH. Of note is that two of the four were deemed to also have unacceptable child status. Issues for child status were responsible behavior, and emotional well-being.

Table 7. System Performance Results by Agency Involvement (Third Quarter, FY 2006)

Complex		Early Intervention	FGC Care Coordinated	IDEA / 504 SBBH	IDEA
Hana	Acceptable	0	1	4	3
	Unacceptable	0	2	2	0

Overall for the entire sample of youths reviewed, child well-being was fairly good, with 83% having acceptable child status. The service system was more of a concern with 67% of the youths having acceptable service team performance. A closer look at the indicators of concern show that although there were strengths in the areas of functional assessments and parent satisfaction, numerous areas are in need of improvement.

Indicators of concern and the corresponding percentage of performance were:

- 1) Child/Family Participation (83%)
- 2) Functioning Service Team (75%)
- 3) Identification of students' focal concerns (75%)
- 4) Addressing focal concerns (83%)
- 5) Overall understanding (83%)
- 6) Having a long-term guiding view (83%)
- 7) Unity of effort across agencies (67%)
- 8) Individual Design/Good Fit (75%)
- 9) Contingency plans for safety and health (40%)
- 10) Overall planning services (75%)
- 11) Resource Availability for Implementation (75%)
- 12) Timely implementation of services (75%)
- 13) Adequate Service Intensity (67%)
- 14) Coordination of services (75%)
- 15) Caregiver Supports (83%)
- 16) Overall implementation (67%)
- 17) Focal Situation Change (83%)
- 18) Academic Achievement (83%)
- 19) Risk reduction (67%),
- 20) Successful transitions (67%)
- 21) Problem solving by teams (75%)

The Hana Complex would benefit from stronger team practices for strengthening the quality of individualized plans and their implementation across the dimensions cited above. These functions should occur at the supervisory and peer review levels. Child status concerns for at least two of the students in the sample, and unacceptable system performance for 33%, require strengthened training and support and ongoing monitoring of the key service system functions. Technical assistance for the FGC and the complex to improve team practices is recommended.

The Hana Complex has developed an action plan that targets a number of strategies designed to enhance communications and cross-training between the Department of Education and the FGC. Careful monitoring of the implementation of activities, and more focused review of the system findings in the Internal Review by the Complex Quality Assurance Committee is strongly recommended.

Kailua Child Status Findings

Kailua met the performance threshold of 93% acceptable in system performance. For the entire sample of youths reviewed, it fell short of the threshold with 79% of the youths having acceptable child status. The youths did well in the areas of safety, physical well-being, home community, and satisfaction; however, indicators of concern and the corresponding percentage of child status were:

- 1) Learning Progress (79%)
- 2) Responsible Behavior (79%)
- 3) Stability (79%)
- 4) Emotional Well-Being (79%)
- 5) Caregiver Functioning (79%)

The Kailua Complex is developing an action plan that will address the identified areas in need of improvement as well as a procedure for monitoring progress.

Adequacy of Internal Review Reports

Each Internal Review generates a report on the results of the reviews, reporting on core performance indicators, and an improvement plan on areas identified as needing strengthening based on review findings and data. The overall goal is to embed reflective practice at all levels that will facilitate improvements that are based on accurate, current data. To assure an accurate read and proactive improvement strategies, the reports are reviewed and feedback is provided. Each report is due thirty-five school days following the conclusion of the Internal Review unless a specific waiver is granted, and feedback is due back to the complex within another thirty working days. Feedback is given in two main areas: the quality of the review process and the quality of the report and plan. All feedback to Internal Review reports for this quarter have been completed and sent to the complexes.

Summary

Based on the scores from the Internal Reviews conducted in the third quarter, the state continues to demonstrate that the vast majority of youths with special needs continue to do well, and consistently receive services that are well coordinated, well implemented, and are producing positive results. System performance has been acceptable for 94% of the 249 students that have been reviewed this school year through the third quarter. A full 94% were found to have acceptable child status. At least two complexes, Hana and Kailua will need focused technical assistance to assure that services are able to impact success for all students.

Complex Data

The following section provides a “profile” of each complex reviewed over the third quarter of fiscal year 2006 (January 2006-March 2006). Presented are data by complex on Internal Reviews and core indicators for the Family Guidance Centers and schools. Data are current for the quarter the Internal Review occurred. Family Guidance Center data include number and percentage of clients: 1) in out of state treatment settings, 2) in out of home treatment, 3) with service delivery gaps, 4) with complaints, and 5) who have current CSPs. Also included are data on the 6) sample size of CSPs that were audited with a CSP quality instrument, and 7) the percentage of those with overall acceptable quality. 8) Staffing vacancies in the FGC for the complex are also presented. School data for each complex include 1) number of service gaps, 2) percentage of referrals that were processed within timelines, 3) number of written and telephone complaints received by the State Office, 4) number of hearing requests, and 5) percentage of special education teachers that are certified. Also presented are data on 6) suspensions (regular education to special education numbers and ratios).

Hana January 2006

Internal Review Results

n=12

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 66.8% (n=8)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	67% (n=8)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 16.7% (n=2)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 16.7% (n=2)	

83%
(n=10)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	7	0%
Out of Home	2	7	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	7	0%
Complaints	0	7	0%
CSP Timelines	7	7	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	50	0	0	0	75

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	287	0	69	0	0	0

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Kalani January 2006

Internal Review Results

n=12

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 84% (n=10)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 8% (n=1)	92% (n=11)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 8% (n=1)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

92%
(n=11)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	13	0%
Out of Home	3	13	23%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	13	0%
Complaints	0	13	0%
CSP Timelines	12	13	92%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
5	5	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	0	85.3

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	3932	20	359	17	.5	4.7

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Ka'u January 2006

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=13)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=13)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	14	0%
Out of Home	5	14	36%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	14	0%
Complaints	0	14	0%
CSP Timelines	10	14	71%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	0	0%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	0	73

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	820	44	177	20	5.4	11.3

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Kapolei January-February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=16

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 88% (n=14)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	88% (n=14)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 6% (n=1)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 6% (n=1)	

94%
(n=15)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	1	34	3%
Out of Home	7	34	21%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	34	3%
Complaints	0	34	0%
CSP Timelines	13	34	38%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	2	67%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	1	1	86.6

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	5988	175	666	57	2.9	8.6

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Mililani January-February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=21

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 95% (n=20)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	95% (n=20)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 5% (n=1)	

**95%
(n=20)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	16	0%
Out of Home	1	16	6%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	16	0%
Complaints	0	16	0%
CSP Timelines	16	16	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	3	92.7

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	7080	117	803	55	1.7	6.8

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Waimea (West Kauai) January-February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=13)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=13)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	14	0%
Out of Home	4	14	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	14	0%
Complaints	0	14	0%
CSP Timelines	4	4	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	1	78.9

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	2400	93	203	28	3.9	13.8

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Honoka'a February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=12

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=12)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=12)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=12)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	27	0%
Out of Home	4	27	15%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	27	0%
Complaints	0	27	0%
CSP Timelines	13	27	48%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2.4	1.6	67%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	0	93

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	2902	192	382	83	6.6	21.7

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

McKinley February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=13)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=13)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	10	0%
Out of Home	1	10	10%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	10	0%
Complaints	0	10	0%
CSP Timelines	8	10	80%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
4	4	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	84	0	0	1	89.3

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	5576	84	488	41	1.5	8.4

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Moanalua February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 84% (n=11)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 8% (n=1)	92% (n=12)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 8% (n=1)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

92%
(n=12)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	16	0%
Out of Home	1	16	6%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	16	0%
Complaints	0	16	0%
CSP Timelines	16	16	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100	0	0	0	95.5

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	4545	103	453	64	2.3	14.1

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Maui High February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=18

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 94% (n=17)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	94% (n=17)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 6% (n=1)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

100%
(n=18)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	41	0%
Out of Home	4	41	10%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	41	0%
Complaints	0	41	0%
CSP Timelines	31	41	76%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	94	0	0	2	88.7

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	6417	105	700	50	1.6	7.1

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Waipahu February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=20

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 80% (n=16)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 10% (n=2)	90% (n=18)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 10% (n=2)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

90%
(n=18)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	21	0%
Out of Home	3	21	14%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	21	0%
Complaints	0	21	0%
CSP Timelines	10	21	48%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	96	1	0	2	88.1

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	7870	303	781	94	4.2	12

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Campbell February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=20

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=20)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=20)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=20)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	27	0%
Out of Home	9	27	33%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	27	0%
Complaints	0	27	0%
CSP Timelines	7	24	29%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	2	67%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	97	0	2	1	88.2

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	7546	93	771	48	1.2	6.2

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Baldwin February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=12

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=12)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=12)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=12)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	26	0%
Out of Home	3	26	12%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	26	0%
Complaints	0	26	0%
CSP Timelines	20	26	77%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	1	50%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	96	0	0	2	85.4

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	3752	53	455	33	1.4	7.3

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Kea'au February 2006

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=12)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 8% (n=1)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**92%
(n=12)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	86	0%
Out of Home	19	86	22%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	86	0%
Complaints	0	86	0%
CSP Timelines	62	86	72%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
4.4	3.7	84%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	95	0	0	0	92

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	2441	250	475	157	10.2	33.1

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Kaimuki March 2006

Internal Review Results

n=14

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 86% (n=12)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 7% (n=1)	93% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 7% (n=1)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

93%
(n=13)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	14	0%
Out of Home	5	14	36%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	14	0%
Complaints	0	14	0%
CSP Timelines	13	14	93%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
5	5	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	87	0	0	0	93.8

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	4962	361	533	86	7.3	16.1

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Lahainaluna March 2006

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 84% (n=11)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 8% (n=1)	92% (n=12)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 8% (n=1)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

92%
(n=12)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	12	0%
Out of Home	0	12	0%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	12	0%
Complaints	0	12	0%
CSP Timelines	12	12	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	98	0	0	1	90.6

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	2654	136	350	50	5.1	14.3

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Kailua March 2006

Internal Review Results

n=14

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 79% (n=11)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 14% (n=2)	93% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 7% (n=1)	

79%
(n=11)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	20	0%
Out of Home	5	20	25%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	20	0%
Complaints	0	20	0%
CSP Timelines	16	17	94%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
6	6	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	% Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	96	0	0	2	90

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	2686	160	456	77	6	16.9

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education